

REMARKS

By this Response, Applicants propose to amend claims 1, 18, and 19. Applicants also propose to cancel claims 5 and 6 by their incorporation into the subject matter of independent claim 1. No claims have been added. Claims 1-4 and 7-20 remain pending in the application.

At the outset, the Examiner is requested to carefully review the claim amendments and the following remarks in connection therewith. It is believed that these claim amendments clearly place the application into condition for allowance by incorporating subject matter of dependent claims into an independent claim. No new matter has been entered.

Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5), because they do not include reference signs described at page 9, paragraph [031], at element “226”.

It is respectfully submitted that this portion of the specification has been amended to correctly refer to element “212”, consistent with the remainder of the specification. By this amendment, no new matter has been entered into the application.

Accordingly, no drawing corrections are necessary, and the Examiner is requested to withdraw the objection to the drawings.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to Claims 18 and 19 as allegedly containing language in the preamble that is inconsistent with language in the body of the claims.

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, claims 18 and 19 are amended herein to re-word the preamble consistent with language in the body of the claim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections to claims 18 and 19.

Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9-16 and 18-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9-16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over non-patented document Ten Minute Guide to Windows NT Workstation 4.0 (hereinafter "*Windows*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,937,406 to *Balabine et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1-7, 9-16 and 20 recite, *inter alia*, completing a request based on a version of an item and a version of an object. Claims 18 and 19 recite, *inter alia*, selectively deleting an item and at least one associated object based on whether a first age of the item is greater than or equal to a second age of at least one associated object.

It is the Examiner's position that *Windows* discloses completing a request based on a version of an item and a version of an object at pages 1 and 2 with a disclosure of moving and copying files and folders within the "Warning" section of *Windows*.

To the contrary, *Windows* fails to teach or suggest any determination of a second time in connection with the folder if a file is moved to the folder. Instead, only a file within the folder is compared to the file to be moved or copied. Likewise, only a folder is compared to a folder if an entire folder is copied or moved to the original folder.

More specifically, the "Warning" section of *Windows* appears to simply disclose giving notice to a user of a selected file and an original file's size and creation, or last modification date.

Thus, a user can look at the attributes of two files (i.e. a replacement file and a file already present in the folder) and decide whether to confirm file replacement. There is no teaching or suggestion in *Windows* that the “folder” containing the file has any time, timestamp, or identifier associated therewith which will be compared as a second time or a second age when a request is made in connection with an item. Accordingly, the “Warning” aspect of *Windows* lacks any relevance to Applicants’ claims that recite a request based on a version of an item and a version of an object.

The Examiner further acknowledges that *Windows* fails to disclose an interactive content database and has applied *Balabine et al.* as disclosing an interactive content database. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to modify *Windows* with the *Balabine et al.* disclosure “because both inventions are directed towards file manipulation operations”. . . “thereby offering the obvious advantage of sharing data seamlessly with both database-aware and database-unaware applications”, referring to col. 3, lines 49-51 thereof. Applicants respectfully disagree.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is only providing motivation as to why *Balabine et al.* disclose features within *Balabine et al.* The Examiner has failed to provide motivation why one skilled in the art would modify Windows with any disclosure from *Balabine et al.* Moreover, *Windows* discloses features associated with WindowsNT. The Examiner has failed to provide motivation why one skilled in the art would modify an operating system to integrate an interactive content database therein. A database is an application that is conventionally executed by an operating system not being a part of an operating system.

Thus, *Windows* in view of *Balabine et al.* fails to disclose, teach or suggest completing a request based on a version of an item and a version of an object, much less an interactive content database, as recited by claims 1-7, 9-16 and 20.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-16 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants further submit that claims 2-7 are in condition for allowance, as are claims 11-16, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1 and 10, respectively.

Rejection of Claims 8 and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Windows* in view of *Balabine et al.*, and further in view of Mac OS X: The Missing Manual (“MacOSX”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Windows and *MacOSX* are well-known to be non-compatible with each other. That is, features on *Windows* and features on *MacOSX* are completely different operating systems, requiring, for example, different codes. Therefore, there is no motivation to combine *Windows* and *MacOSX* as attempted by the Examiner and the combination fails to establish a *prima facie* obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Further, even if combinable, Applicants respectfully submit that *Windows* in view of *Balabine et al.* fail to disclose, teach or suggest the features recited by claims 8 and 17 and further that *MacOSX* fails to supply the missing teachings of *Windows*. Thus, claims 8 and 17 are patentable over *Windows* in view of *Balabine et al.* and *MacOSX*.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 8 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants further submit

that claims 8 and 17 are in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1 and 10, respectively.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 13, 17 and 35-42 into condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the proposed amendments of claims 1, 18 and 19 do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully point out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicants' invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow Applicants to reply to the final rejections and place the application into condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicants submit that entry of the amendment would place the application into better form for Appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references applied against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 50-2961.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 9, 2007

By: Barbara A. Fisher
Barbara A. Fisher
Reg. No. 31, 906

MH2 Technology Law Group LLP
1951 Kidwell Drive, Suite 550
Tysons Corner, VA 22182
Tel: 703.917.0000 Ext. 121